

MOST AMERICANS ARE DISTURBED AT THE PUBLIC DEMONSTRATIONS IN PROTEST OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed, as I think most Americans are disturbed, at the public demonstrations being mounted at this time to protest the war in Vietnam. While each citizen has the right to express his or her views, I strongly believe that there is attached to that right a responsibility to insure that any expression of protest contribute to a better understanding of the issue at hand—and toward a constructive solution.

Furious protest that offers no direction, no clarity, no reasonable alternative, is actually destructive to the process of public problem solving.

Those of us who are searching for a new and better policy in Vietnam are hindered by massive demonstrations that only serve to heighten public emotion and multiply public confusion.

If our national direction in Vietnam or elsewhere is to change, it will finally change on the basis of the quietness of careful thought—the detailed examination of complex issues and relationships—and the soundness and rationality of the alternative policies suggested.

It is the sounder idea, not the loudest voice, that will finally prevail; the most thoughtful, factual inquiry, not the most enraged passion.

Mr. Speaker, those who choose to substitute violent protest for precise reason serve to undermine themselves, their country, and those in positions of public responsibility that are searching to find a better answer in Vietnam. Violent, directionless Vietnam protesters actually serve to delay the development of a new and sounder policy in Vietnam.

ADMINISTRATION DISPLAYS WEAKNESS IN DEALING WITH PLANNED DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am not as concerned about the planned demonstrations to be held in Washington and throughout this Nation as I am concerned about the display of weakness on the part of this administration which is reflected in its willingness to negotiate with those whose purpose it is to embarrass our Government and to divide our Nation at a time when the welfare and safety of our young men in Vietnam is at stake.

I am concerned about the weakness of an administration that has reacted to threats by closing the White House to visitors, while the officially declared excuse is that repairs are to be made no one can ignore the more obvious reason which is to prevent incidents, which would arise out of sit-ins during the demonstration.

Many law abiding citizens have saved their money for years to take a trip to Washington. Now they are denied their rights to visit the White House because of the threats of those who are planning the mass demonstration in Washington. Must the rights and conveniences of our responsible citizens give way to the irresponsible actions of those who believe they are above the law?

More important is the fact that the show of appeasement on the part of the administration amounts to surrender. Saturday it will be closing down the White House—a victory for those who show contempt for our Government. The next time the defense establishment. Later the legislative halls of Congress.

It is high time we repudiate Government by appeasement and strengthen the voice and power of the law abiding citizens who have a respect for law and order and are willing to make their voices heard in the ballot box instead of on the streets.

"JOIN THE FIGHT"—PROJECT OF BURLINGTON COUNTY TIMES

(Mr. CAHILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and to the country, a contribution being made by the Burlington County Times, a daily newspaper published in the district which I represent in Congress, to the servicemen serving in U.S. posts throughout the world. The Burlington County Times has been sponsoring a "join the fight" program throughout the entire area serviced by the paper.

The program urges the citizens of Burlington County to correspond with servicemen and to send them gifts. Each week, the newspaper publishes what has become a growing list of servicemen stationed in various parts of the world, particularly in Vietnam. The editors of the newspaper anticipate that a great number of Christmas gifts will be received by the men in Vietnam and in other areas of the world as a result of this program.

I am happy to report that the "join the fight" program is receiving the enthusiastic support and commendation of people from all walks of life in the Burlington County area.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this type of activity is invaluable in maintaining the high morale of our troops. It is a clear indication of the thoughtfulness, the generosity and the support of the citizens back home. It is certainly a great antidote to some of the draft card burnings that our troops have heard about through other periodicals. I am also convinced that as a result of this correspondence, many new and lasting friendships will be developed. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to commend publicly the Burlington County Times, its publisher, editor, and entire staff and to respectfully suggest to other similar periodicals throughout the country participation in a similar program.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 321 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS ASSIST THE NORTH VIETNAMESE

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything that is more demoralizing to our troops in Vietnam than these anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in our country. And while I know that there are many people who are sincerely concerned about the war, and who are seriously and honestly looking for a solution, I wonder if those who have been urging that we cease the bombing of North Vietnam at this time have considered the fact that casualties among our American troops would increase seriously if such a bombing pause were ordered by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have said here before—and I repeat it now—our best intelligence shows that our bombings of North Vietnam have successfully pinned down 175,000 North Vietnamese soldiers who are manning the anti-aircraft installations in North Vietnam. We have pinned down another 300,000 Communist soldiers in North Vietnam who are being used to supervise the repair of the damages that our bombers do. Women and children do the work but soldiers supervise them. That is a half million soldiers. If we were to end the bombing now with no assurances from the North Vietnamese that they are not going to move those troops into South Vietnam and use them against our soldiers, we would increase our casualties substantially. The President has said repeatedly, time and time again, that he is prepared to end the bombing the moment the Communists are willing to give us assurances that they will not move these one-half million North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam and use them against our soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, those who have been urging this bombing pause should consider the consequences of their counsel if we were to release those half million Communist troops who are now pinned down in North Vietnam. I am sure it does not take any expert to realize that our casualties would mount, and who is willing to take the responsibility of seeing more American boys killed in South Vietnam?

So I hope that those who are going to participate in these anti-Vietnam war demonstrations will be cognizant of the fact that they in fact are prolonging the war, and that they in fact are contributing to the breakdown of morale among our troops, and they are in fact playing right into the hands of the Communists.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE TWO REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Friday, October 20, to file two reports adopted today on food and drug administration procedures for the selection of laboratory sites and the administration of research grants in public health service. This request has the approval of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 322]

Abbott	Fountain	Purcell
Ashley	Fuqua	Rarick
Bell	Gettys	Rees
Betts	Hagan	Rumsfeld
Blatnik	Hébert	Sandman
Boggs	Herlong	St. Onge
Bolton	Holland	Sisk
Brademas	Jonas	Stephens
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Jones, N.C.	Tenzer
Button	Kazen	Thompson, N.J.
Cederberg	Landrum	Tuck
Conyers	Latta	Tunney
Culver	Leggett	Utt
Dawson	McEwen	Watts
Diggs	Matsunaga	Williams, Miss.
Dwyer	Morgan	Willis
Ellberg	O'Hara, Mich.	Wright
Flynt	Patman	Wyatt
Ford, Gerald R.	Pryor	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving

the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of non-commercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting television and radio; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 18, 1967.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend and to thank the Members who served on the conference committee, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNIGAY], for their diligence and their cooperation in getting this conference report out and in working with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the House conferees did a very good and a very fine job, because of the 15 points that were in difference—the 15 points that the House was in difference with the other body—all but four of these were resolved in favor of the position of the House of Representatives. Of those four upon which we did not get full and complete support of the position of the House, we only receded in part from our stand in the House.

Therefore, we feel that we came out with a bill almost identical with the one that passed the House some time ago.

I should like, briefly, to go over some of the points in order to demonstrate to the Members of the House what did take place. However, I would like first to reiterate what I said on the floor when this legislation was up for debate, and that is this: I feel that perhaps this could be one of the most important bills to come out of the 90th Congress. It was stated in a letter from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges that his legislation had been compared in importance to the Morrill Act of 1862 with reference to its importance to education in the United States, I believe, and am of the firm opinion, that this legislation is that important or, perhaps, more so.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now outline the more important points that were in disagreement and on which we receded. I shall not take the time of the House to explain the others.

The version of the other body contains no definition with reference to the term "educational television or radio programs." The version of the House contained the following definition, "pro-

grams which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

The other body was adamant on striking out our definition. However, we were able to retain the main part which we feel is the positive side of it and not the negative side of the question by retaining the language, "which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes." We acceded to the deletion of the words "and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

By so doing, the basic House definition was retained and, at the same time, dispel any feeling that educational programs may not be entertaining or entertainment programs, educational.

This is one of the first changes that was made in the House version.

The next was a clarification of our requirement that there be strict adherence to objectivity and balance in the presentation of controversial programs. The conferees agreed unanimously that this section requiring strict adherence to objectivity and balance on all programs of a controversial nature should be clarified so that such adherence should be with respect to a series of programs. In other words, we wanted to make clear that if a program comes up at one time and one side is presented that we could not indict it because of that one program where there were to be two programs, or a series of programs. Balance and objectivity might not be achieved in any one program of a series, but the overall series wherein opposing viewpoints were presented would and should be a balanced and objective presentation.

To distribute programs produced for educational broadcasting, the Senate version provided for the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnections. The House version only provided for a system of interconnection. Because of concern that the House version might preclude the establishment and development of statewide and regional systems of interconnection, this ambiguity was eliminated, by the House accepting the Senate version of this provision.

Another important provision considered by the conferees concerned the ability of the corporation to deal directly with communications common carriers, such as A.T. & T., in order to make arrangements for interconnection facilities. Under the House version the corporation was not authorized to deal directly with such carriers but, instead, could only make interconnection arrangements through "nonprofit" intermediaries, who in turn would deal with the carriers. To provide the corporation with more interconnection flexibility, the House accepted the Senate version of this provision, which did not contain the word "nonprofit," thereby authorizing the corporation to deal directly with communications common carriers.

The last question of any contention involved changing the Senate word "what" to "whether." In title III the Senate had authorized a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio to help determine "what" Federal

aid should be provided, and the form such aid should take.

The House version provided that such a study should be addressed to the question of "whether" Federal aid should be provided. This provision is now provided for in the conference substitute, which is otherwise the same as the Senate bill. In this connection "radio" is now included in the study authorized by title III.

Now, these are the only major changes that were made in the bill which passed this House on September 21. The conferees, and I as one of the conferees, feel we did a very good job on behalf of the House in bringing back almost the identical bill that it passed. We had 15 points in contention, and the House did not recede completely on any of them. The four points that we partially receded I believe helped to make it a better bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] whatever time he may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from West Virginia has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the chairman has done a good job in explaining most of the provisions. There were two important parts of the bill when it was on the floor of the House which the House insisted on being in the original bill, and on which we maintained our position in the conference. One in which we said that the management of any one station or anyone speaking for them could not editorialize, and second, the station could not support or oppose any candidate for public office.

In the Senate version there was no such provision of any kind. The Senate receded with a slight change in the language, but no difference in the real meaning of the provision in the bill so that the provision against editorializing or supporting or opposing any candidate is retained.

The second change was the question on how this corporation board of directors was to be appointed. The House insisted—and this was a drastic change from the Senate version. The House version provided that no more than eight out of the 15-member board could be from one political party. We felt from the experience we had had with the various agencies in this town that it had worked well where an agency was made up of four of one party, and three of another, or five of one party and four of another, or six of one party and five of another. We felt this worked extremely well in that the minority kept constant check on the majority to insure that there was no corruption, or inefficiency.

So we did provide, and were able to retain, in the final conference report, that no more than eight of the fifteen members of the board shall be of one party.

I think the third one that you will probably want to know about is that in programs of a controversial nature there is a specific provision and many of you here in this body have talked with me about this provision. We tried to make it extremely clear, and I quote from the report:

In addition to that, that in the case of programs of a controversial nature, there

must be strict adherence to objectivity and balance.

We did have a difference with the Senate over interconnections. That is if these stations chose to hook up at certain times of the year, maybe a half dozen times I would guess, to present programs, how are you going to do this?

The Senate had a provision that did not make any difference between profit and nonprofit. In the House version we had nonprofit alone. We did change this to allow interconnection to be made in the discretion of the board as to whether or not it could be done through private enterprises or through nonprofit enterprise, feeling that if it were necessary they could go to nonprofit, but probably they would want to use the profit system as probably the most economical system that could be used for interconnection.

But we felt that it was best to leave to the board itself to determine which method they wanted to use.

The fourth provision that I think you will want to know about was that the House amendment provides the public corporation with authority to assist in the establishment and development of a system to be used for distribution of educational television or radio programs.

The Senate version authorized the corporation to assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnection.

On this question we adopted the Senate version and I believe there is good reason for that.

We did provide for a system of records and audits which were not provided for adequately, we felt, in the Senate version. I think finally we agreed on one important thing and that was to provide a study of instructional television including the relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining how federal aid should be provided therefor. We provided \$500,000 for this study.

We believe this will assist greatly in the portion of the spectrum having to do with educational and instructional television.

Those are in essence the changes that I think are of any substance. We agreed unanimously on those.

I would say on the number of changes that the House won approximately 70 percent and the Senate on 30 percent of the changes in the conference that resulted in the final version.

I recommend that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] such time as he may require.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the chairman yielding to me.

I would like to commend the chairman of the committee and the minority leader of the committee, and those who have served on this conference committee, for what I see as a very fine job in bringing to the House a bill which was good when it left. In my opinion, it is even better now.

As has already been stated, we concurred slightly on only four of the 15

points which were in contention. This was a most amicable and productive conference.

I certainly rise in support of this bill and will say that in my opinion it is one of the finest pieces of legislation that has come from our committee in a good while.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I consider this to have been a most productive conference. Although on some points the House conferees did recede, by and large we maintained the position of the House even on those points because we held up the intention of the House on what we had really wanted to do.

There was one point that I wanted to discuss briefly. We deleted one word, the word "nonprofit." Under the Senate bill the corporation would have been authorized to arrange by contract or by grant interconnecting facilities. They could then distribute programs to the various stations. Under the House bill the corporation would have been authorized to have made these contracts or grants only to nonprofit agencies.

The conferees felt there would be unusual occurrences or special occasions on which a program of nationwide interest should be distributed to those stations that wanted to carry such a program, and prohibiting the corporation from making these interconnection facilities themselves, and directly providing for those interconnection facilities would have been detrimental to the purposes of the act.

So the word "nonprofit" was deleted.

This action does not mean that the corporation is going to enter into any full-time networking arrangements. They will still be prohibited by the language in the bill from doing this. They will still not be able to do any broadcasting as such. They will only be taking advantage of this interconnection authority on special occasions whenever this may arise.

Also it is not only the intention of the managers, as is clear in the reports of both the House and the other body, but also as it is stated in the bill itself, where any interconnection is made, it will be within the discretion of the local stations to determine whether or not they want to receive or to carry a given program. That is one point I wished to emphasize.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] who has been a very strong supporter of this legislation, and who has spoken not only to me but to other members of the committee on several occasions expressing his strong support of this public broadcasting section.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment Congressman STAGGERS, the ranking minority member, Mr. SPRINGER, my friend from North Carolina, Mr. BROYHILL, and the other members of the committee for the fine job they did in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. It was unfortunate that I was unavoidably detained on September 21 when the bill originally

came up, because I have had a long interest in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. I think the committee did a remarkable job in conference and with the overall bill. I strongly support the measure and hope it will pass today.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television; and for other purposes."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves that the House recede from its amendment to the title.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report on the motion to recede from the title amendment was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SAFETY OF CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 944 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 944

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13178) to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the United States Capitol Buildings and the United States Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclu-

sion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 13178, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2310) and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 13178 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is an open rule, which provides for 1 hour of general debate and, of course, for amendment under the 5-minute rule. This bill, simply and briefly, is a bill that would augment the present laws dealing with the protection of the U.S. Capitol, its grounds, and its buildings. To be perfectly frank about this bill, it is brought about because of the fact that there is another one of the numerous marches upon Washington anticipated here within the next few days.

This bill, as I said, would supplement existing legislation which goes back 100 years or more, under which the grounds of the Capitol were protected, but not the buildings of the Capitol.

Under the old law the grounds but not the buildings were protected, and the violations are misdemeanors with nominal fines provided.

This bill would cover the buildings themselves and would take care of such instances as we have had in the recent past.

Some Members will recall that only a few years ago there was a group of misguided Puerto Ricans who entered this Capitol Building itself and up there in the corner of the gallery they arose and began a holocaust of shooting and a general disturbance here in the Capitol itself. A number of the Members were shot.

Only a few weeks ago another group forced themselves into the Capitol. They forced the guards up against the walls, entered the gallery itself, and created a great disturbance in the deliberations of the Nation's business.

Not too long ago there was another group—which, incidentally, I believe was from my State; something rather unusual—who came into this Capitol and sat down outside of a committee room and refused to budge. This was the misnamed Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi, an extreme leftist group.

So this proposed legislation would protect the Capitol, its grounds and its buildings, and its Members, from these misguided people who are bent on obstructing if not, in fact, destroying this, the world's most democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I am amazed

to see what is going on, to pick up the papers each day, and to look at television, and see what is going on in this country in the subversive attacks upon this great haven of liberty, the United States of America and its institutions.

Now we are told that there will be possibly 250,000—I doubt if there will be anywhere near that number—who are going to march upon the Pentagon tomorrow or the next day. They are going to march upon this Capitol. They are going to protest, and they are going to protest violently about the war in Vietnam.

This is not a question of whether the war in Vietnam is a popular war, or even whether we should be there. The question is whether the institutions of this Government are to be attacked in any such manner.

We see these riots going on all over the country. People attack this institution which guarantees to them liberty and the pursuit of happiness—and, incidentally, now under the new concept, prosperity, because anyone who does not have better than \$3,000 income is entitled to Government aid.

Yet they are never satisfied.

Sometimes I wonder if this is because we are too busy trying to appease these small minority groups. When I say "minority groups," Mr. Speaker, I do not have reference to the color of anybody's skin, either. I am talking about these groups who are continuously attacking our Government and its institutions.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate: Here are a couple of, I do not know whether to call them circulars, brochures, or just leaflets, of propaganda. Some of this left-wing group saw fit to organize down in my State some few years ago a group known as the Freedom Democratic Party, whatever that is. They undertook to take over the government and they are still trying to take over the government of my State. I think anyone who is familiar with that situation is bound to be familiar with the fact that they are but a part of a nationwide conspiracy to bring about demoralization and the final overthrow of our Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read all of this, but I just want to exhibit it to you here, to those who happen to be interested. Here is one. On the front page I draw your attention to this drawing with the instruction how to make a Molotov cocktail. I could do so, but I am not going to go into all of the details here as to what they propose to do.

Now I have to use the pigmentation of the skin, although I prefer not to, although this movement is not confined to Negroes. We have some ultra-left-wing white people who are also parties to it. They are advocating the accumulation of guns. They are advocating that for every Negro who happens to be killed that at least 10 white people be killed in retaliation. They are advocating that the election machinery and all the institutions of the State be taken over by this small, militant, misguided group. Incidentally, these are the same people I referred to a moment ago that came into this Capitol and sat down outside of